

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-10 are presently pending in the present application. The present Amendment amends claim 7, cancels claims 1-4 without prejudice or disclaimer, and adds claims 8-10. No new matter is introduced by this amendment. New claims 8-10 are based on canceled claims 2-4.

Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments set forth herein as the amendments cancel rejected claims, and comply with a requirement of form expressly set forth in the Office Action. The added claims mirror canceled claims 2-4 and depend from claim 7, which is believed to be in condition for allowance, and therefore are not believed to present any substantial new issues on the merits. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments set forth herein.

In the Office Action, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yoshizawa et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,862,461) in view of *Hashimoto* (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,863), claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yoshizawa et al.* in view of *Hashimoto* and *Loehner et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,347,239), claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yoshizawa et al.* in view of *Hashimoto* and *Gattz* (U.S. Patent No. 3,369,096), and claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yoshizawa et al.* in view of *Hashimoto* and *Tomita et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,353).

Regarding the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the Office Action rejects these claims as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 7 has been amended

as suggested on page 6 of the Office Action. Thus, Applicants request the withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) have been rendered moot by the cancellation of the rejected claims.

Claim 7 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the indefiniteness rejection. Thus, claim 7 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, dependent claims 8-10 are allowable for at least the reasons indicated for claim 7, from which they depend.

Therefore, the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (703) 519-9957 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

July 25, 2008
Date

/Christopher D. Ward/
Christopher D. Ward
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 41,367

Phouphanomketh Ditthavong
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44,658

918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 519-9957
Fax. (703) 519-9958